DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 238 043 CS 504 457

AUTHOR Warfel, Katherine Ann
TITLE Gender Schemas and Perceptions of Speech Style.
PUB DATE Nov 83
NOTE 44p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Speech Communication Association (69th, Washington, DC, November 10-13, 1983).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Behavior Patterns; College Students; *Communication Research; Females; Higher Education; *Interpersonal Communication; Interpersonal Competence; Males; *Sex Bias; Sex Role; Sex Stereotypes; Social Cognition; Speech Communication; *Student Attitudes; Theories
IDENTIFIERS *Communicator Style; Femininity; *Gender Schema Theory; Masculinity

ABSTRACT

A study examined S.L. Bem's Gender Schema Theory as it relates to communicator style. It was hypothesized that (1) speakers using a "powerless" speech style would be perceived less positively than would "powerful" speakers, and (2) sex-typed subjects, that is, those who adhere to a traditional sex role schema, would perceive both powerful and powerless speech in women more negatively than would nonsex-typed subjects. Subjects, 193 college students, were presented with transcribed interpersonal exchanges in which one speaker's communication style was manipulated to appear powerful or powerless, and subjects' impressions of the speakers were recorded on a number of interpersonal attribution items. Subjects then completed the Bem Sex-Role Inventory. The results failed to substantiate many of the predicted differences between sex-typed and nonsex-typed persons' perceptions of speakers' power. Speakers using powerless language features were perceived to be less dominant than powerful speakers. Sex-typed subjects associated powerful speech with masculinity and powerless speech with femininity, while nonsex-typed subjects did not, but no evidence was found to support the second hypothesis, specifically that powerful speech in women would be viewed more negatively by sex-typed individuals than by nonsex-typed subjects. (HTH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

ED238043

GENDER SCHEMAS
AND
PERCEPTIONS OF SPEECH STYLE

Paper presented to the Student Section
of the
Speech Communication Association Convention
November, 1983
Washington, D.C.

Katherine Ann Warfel, M.A.
University of Texas at Austin, TX
Department of Speech Communication

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Katherine Ann Warfel

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

CS 504457

ABSTRACT

This study examined Bem's Gender Schema Theory (1981a) as it relates to communicator style. Subjects (N=193) were presented with transcribed interpersonal exchanges in which one speaker's communication style was manipulated to appear "powerful" or "powerless". "Powerless" speech was characterized by the use of qualifiers, compound requests, tag questions, and disclaimers. "Powerful" speech lacked these message elements. Subjects' impressions of the speakers were recorded on a number of interpersonal attribution items. Each subject then completed the Bem Sex-Role Inventory (1974). Results failed to substantiate many of the predicted differences between sex-typed and non-sex-typed persons perceptions of speakers' power. Two main effects for powerful speech were found: (1) speakers using "powerless" language features were perceived to be less dominant than "powerful" speakers; and, (2) "powerless" speakers were perceived to be more competent than "powerful" speakers. In the second part of the analysis, a sub-sample was drawn from the original subject pool that consisted of those who were most sex-typed (51), and those who were least sex-typed (45); according to scores on the Bem Sex-Role Inventory. Results gained from this sub-sample were very similar to those obtained from the larger sample. Implications of these findings for researchers of power issues and of Gender Schema Theory are discussed.

Gender Schemas and Perceptions of Speech Style

A central issue for contemporary women is gaining power and influence in "A Man's World." For example; women, as a group, are not as successful in the field of business as are their male counterparts. The 1970* U.S. Census figures revealed that of the 1.4 million people employed in the category of Managers and Administrators (non-farm), only sixteen percent were women. Only seventeen percent of the 2.3 million workers earning $15,000 or more per year were women. The median income for women was less than half that for men (calculated acorss all job categories). At the national level, the overwhelming majority of Congressional representatives are male. Obviously, women hold the minority of powerful and influential positions in our society.

Authors of modern "how-to" manuals on the means to achieve success encourage women to become more dominant and assertive. They suggest that aspirants to positions of power and authority may reach their goals by adopting a personal style characterized by directness and command (Hennig and Jardim, 1977). In short, by mimicing the behaviors of those in power, one will ascend to power as well. In this sense, the actor borrows power from the action. Others criticize this emphasis on behavior. Hopper (1982) suggests that the behavior of an influential person is labeled "powerful" because of its relationship to that influential person and not due to its intrinsically powerful nature. By themselves,

*Due to clerical error, 1980 income figures for men and women across occupational categories were unavailable at the time this manuscript was in preparation. 1980 figures will be substituted (if available) when the paper is presented at convention.

actions are neither powerful nor powerless. Context gives meaning to behavior in that the power of an action rests in the actor, not the behavior alone.

Clearly, two competing ideas emerge from this discussion. One is that actors are perceived to be powerless because they engage in powerless actions. It follows from this assertion that women lack power because their actions lack power--the "deficit hypothesis." The second position is that actions are perceived to be powerless due to the powerlessness of the source. This suggests that women's behavior is perceived to be powerless, not because of the nature of the action, but due to its female source--the "discrimination hypothesis."

The Deficit Hypothesis:

Bem (1981a) argues that all human societies allocate adult roles on the basis of sex. In light of this, socialization patterns in all cultures are geared to prepare the young for their anticipated adult roles. For example, industrialization of a society usually precipitates a division of labor between the sexes: males become "breadwinners" and females become "homemakers." Since communication behavior often mirrors the active roles people play in their lives (Haas, 1979); this occupational segregation may have generated a linguistic dichotomy along gender lines: i.e., males' speech tended to become assertive, and females' speech supportive, in line with the nature of their positions in the world.

In fact, there is evidence that suggests that women's speech is perceived to be non-assertive in nature. Haas (1979) points out that women's speech style has been stereotyped as tentative

and supportive. She concludes that actual empirical evidence for this notion is mixed: "Limited evidence confirms that males are more assertive and issue more directives; females are more often tentative and supportive" (p. 623).

Women's supportive speech style may have a systematically negative impact on others' perception of them. "Powerful" speech styles positively affect listeners' perceptions of speaker credibility, attractiveness and persuasiveness (Erickson, Lind, Johnson and O'Barr, 1978). Since women's speech may be characterized as "powerless" (in the terms of the Erickson, et al. study), it follows that women may be perceived negatively on a number of dimensions due to their allegedly powerless style.

Lakoff (1975) has suggested that certain characteristics of speech style traditionally evidenced by women lead to the perception of women as more vague, more polite, less assertive, less intelligent, less self-confident, and less credible than their male counterparts. Although Lakoff herself did not present empirical evidence in support of her position, her initial probes into this area have sparked empirical investigation of this phenomenon.

Newcombe and Arnkoff (1979) tested the assumption that three of Lakoff's linguistic variables (tag questions, qualifiers and compound requests) affect person perception. Their results indicated that all three variables decreased perceived assertiveness of the speaker, regardless of the sex of the speaker. A second experiment using an older subject pool provided very similar results. Bradley's (1981) tests of the effects of the use of qualifying phrases by both men and women led her to conclude that

women who used qualifying phrases were judged more harshly on a variety of dimensions (dynamism, knowledge, intelligence) than were their male counterparts; and less positively overall than those who did not use qualifying phrases.

To summarize, speech style affects listener's perceptions of the speaker. Of particular interest here are results indicating that certain elements of speech (e.g., qualifying phrases, etc.) may have adverse effects on a listener's perceptions of a number of speaker qualities. This is particularly significant to this discussion in that the elements of speech that lead to negative listener response are those that have been linked to women's speech (Lakoff, 1975). This is the basic premise of the deficit hypothesis in that persons (i.e., women) are perceived negatively due to their "powerless" speech style. This can be expressed in the following testable hypothesis:

H1: Overall, encoders using a "powerless" speech style are perceived less positively[1] than those using a "powerful" speech style.

The Discrimination Hypothesis:

The discrimination hypothesis involves the argument that women's influence in society is diminished due to some commonly held stereotypes of women. Women's social image is defined as one best suited to child-rearing and housekeeping--not to commercial or societal leadership. Such beliefs are, in fact, widespread. McKee and Sherriffs (1957) report that both sexes perceive males as calm, logical and ambitious. Females are perceived as frivolous and shy. Overall, men are perceived as more normal and

psychologically healthy than women (Broverman, Broverman, Clarkson, Rosenkrantz and Vogel, 1970). Sex-typing begins early in life (Kohlberg, 1966). Even young children associate greater power, competence and strength with men than with women. Similar findings emerged using different populations in studies by Goldberg (1968) and by Mischel (1974). Children have better recall for stereotyped behaviors than for non-stereotyped behaviors (Koblinsky, Cruse, and Sugawara, 1978). This suggests the strength of stereotypes in organizing perceptions of others. In summary, negative stereotypes of women exist in society. These beliefs may lead to discrimination against women in terms of opportunities for leadership and influence in our society.

There is evidence which suggests that certain individuals are more likely to respond to traditional stereotypes of the role of women in society than are others. Bem's (1981a) Gender Schema Theory rests on the notion that gender orientation is a meaningful predictor of attitudes and behaviors. She theorizes that gender becomes a highly salient and pervasive element of the self-concept through the process of socialization. This is so in that, in most cultures, adult roles are allocated on the basis of biological sex. The "gender dichotomy" pervades social existence, placing its indelible stamp on the maturing child. Through the process of sex-typing, a child learns to make the distinction between masculine and feminine functions, roles, personality attributes, activities, and so on. So ubiquitous is this dichotomy, according to Bem, that individuals learn to organize perceptions in terms of a gender schema. Briefly, Bem's Gender Schema Theory

proposes that:

> ...the phenomenon of sex-typing derives, in part, from gender-based schematic processing, from a generalized readiness to process information on the basis of the sex-linked associations that constitute the gender schema (p. 355).

Specifically, Bem proposed that sex-typing is partially caused by the assimilation of the self-concept into the gender schema. In this way, the individual incorporates the gender schema as an organizing principle in perception. Findings that gender attitudes affect recall patterns (Bem, 1981a; Kail and Levine, 1976; Liben and Signorella, 1980; Markus; 1982) as well as attributes about the self (Bem, 1981a; Markus; 1982; Tunnell, 1981) and others (Tunnell, 1981) lend support to Bem's Gender Schema Theory.

To summarize, these studies indicate that an individual's gender schema affects the ways in which information is processed about the self and others. Specifically, as Bem (1981a) states, "...the gender schema becomes a prescriptive standard or guide... (p. 355)" for the evaluation of the self and of others. These studies provide support for the discrimination hypothesis in that sex-typed individuals tend to discriminate on the basis of gender distinctions. It follows from this notion that sex-typed individuals might discriminate between speakers on the basis of the speaker's sex to a greater extent to a greater extent than would non-sex-typed individuals. This argument translates into two hypotheses:

> H2: Sex-typed individuals perceive women using a "powerless" speech style less positively than

*should read: Markus, Crane, Bernstein and Siladi

non-sex-typed individuals.

H3: Sex-typed individuals perceive women using a "powerful" speech style less positively than non-sex-typed individuals.

A Combination Hypothesis:

There is some evidence that suggests that the deficit and discrimination hypotheses may be related. Sex-typed individuals tend to be more sensitive to gender distinctions than are non-sex-typed individuals (Bem, 1981a; Lippa, 1977). It could be that sex-typed individuals, with their traditional sex-role orientations, would tend to notice powerless speech on the part of women more than of men, as powerlessness is in line with stereotyped notions of femininity. Bradley's (1981) finding that listeners' perceptions of female speakers who used speech qualifiers were more negative than listeners' perceptions of male speakers who used speech qualifiers could be an artifact of this listener bias on the part of sex-typed persons. Deaux and Major's (1977) finding that androgynous persons deal more "evenhandedly" with others than do sex-typed persons suggests that this tolerance might extend to perceptions of speech style. That is, gender bias would be absent from androgynous persons' perceptions of speech style. Thus, in the case of the androgynous listener, powerful speakers would be viewed more positively than powerless speakers, regardless of speaker sex. In the case of the sex-typed listener, both powerful and powerless female speakers would be perceived less positively than their male counterparts, but especially so in the case of the "powerless" female speaker. In this case, both discrimination against female speakers and deficient female speech affect the final

attributions made about the speaker. This position may be expressed as two testable hypotheses:

H4: Sex-typed individuals perceive female communicators using a "powerless" speech style less positively than male speakers using a "powerless" speech style.

H5: Sex-typed individuals perceive female communicators using a "powerful" speech style less positively than male speakers using a "powerful" speech style.

If the deficit hypothesis is correct, then results should indicate a main effect for speech style in that powerful speakers will be perceived more positively than powerless speakers, overall. That is, hypothesis 1 would be confirmed. If the discrimination hypothesis is correct, than results should indicate an interaction between subject sex-type and speaker sex in that sex-typed individuals will perceive female speakers less positively than male speakers across categories. That is, hypotheses 2 and 3 would be confirmed. If the combination hypothesis is correct, then results should indicate an interaction between subject sex-type, speaker sex, and speech style in that both powerful and powerless female speakers will be perceived less positively than their male counterparts by sex-typed individuals, but especially so in the case of the powerless female speakers. That is, a confirmation of hypotheses 4 and 5 would be expected.

Method

Independent Variables:

This study employed four independent variables: communication setting, speaker sex, gender orientation of subject, and speaker communicator style. Speaker sex was operationally defined as the biological sex of the speaker. Subject's gender orientation was determined through the use of Bem's Sex-Role Inventory (1974), the most widely accepted instrument in its class for the indentification of gender orientation (Bem, 1974, 1975).[2] For the purposes of this study, individuals were divided into two groups:

(1) sex-typed individuals: those scoring above the median point only on the scale that corresponds to their biological sex; and,

(2) non-sex-typed individuals: those who scored above the median point on both scales (androgynous), and those who scored below the median point on both scales (undifferentiated).[3]

Cross-sex-typed individuals (those scoring above the median only on the scale opposite to their biological sex) were excluded from the analysis. The rationale for this decision is in Bem's contention that the schematic processing of cross-sex-typed individuals is not explained by her Gender Schema Theory (1981b: p. 369).

For the purpose of this investigation, speaker communicator style was defined as either "powerful" or "powerless", based on the definitions provided below. A "powerless" speech style was defined as that speech style characterized by the use of four message elements:

(1) Qualifiers: phrases such as "kind of," "I guess," and/or "maybe", which blunt the definitiveness of an assertion;

(2) Compound requests: as opposed to a simple request; softens assertion power implied in making a request: e.g., "Won't you please close the door?", as opposed to the simple request, "Close the door."

(3) Tag questions: indicate a lack of certainty and/or assertiveness on the part of the speaker: e.g., "It's sure cold outside, isn't it?"; and,

(4) Disclaimers: express uncertainty; e.g., beginning a statement with phrases such as, "I may be mistaken, but...."[4]

In short, a "powerless" speech style may be described as expressing tentativeness, uncertainty and a lack of assertiveness. A powerful speech style may be defined as evidencing a lack of the aforementioned elements of speech style. "Powerful" speech may be described as expressing self-assurance, certainty and assertiveness.

The rationale for the use of the four elements of speech style suggested is fourfold. First, these elements are similar in that all express a lack of confidence in one's position and in oneself. Second, they relate to syntax as well as lexicon. Key (1975) and Callary (1974) have both suggested that syntax is a meaningful determinant of status and sex differences. Trudgill (1972) and Bradley (1981) have also emphasized the importance of syntax and lexicon in the determination of social status. Third,

these speech elements have emerged in similar form in previous studies concerning effects of speech style on person perception (Bradley, 1981; Erickson, et al., Newcombe and Arnkoff, 1979). Finally, to maintain some element of naturalness of speech, the manipulation had to be limited to only those speech elements that have been shown to have an influence on person perception.

The final independent variable was communication setting. In the interests of generalizability, there were three different settings for the exchanges in the scripts (to be described later under the Manipulation section): a courtroom setting (as in Erickson, et al., 1978), a business setting, and an interpersonal exchange in a typical social setting.

Dependent Variables:

One of the major premises of this study was that sex-typed individuals would differ significantly from non-sex-typed individuals in their reactions to male and female speakers on a variety of interpersonal measures. A number of studies have utilized measures of credibility and attractiveness in the judgement of speakers' style (Erickson, et al., 1978; Bradley, 1981). For this reason, a number of different scale elements were brought together from these various earlier studies concerned with judgements of speaker credibility and attractiveness. Thirty-two nine-point semantic differential scales were taken from the following:

(1) credibility items from Whitehead's (1968) investigation of factors of source credibility;

(2) competence and attraction items from Hopper's (1977) study of language attitudes in the employment interview setting;

(3) credibility and attraction items from the Erickson, et al. (1978) study of power in speech;[5] and,

(4) credibility and attraction items from Bradley's (1981) study of women's speech.

Scale polarity was reversed on a number of items to discourage random responding.

A supplementary ten item personal and task attraction scale was taken from McCroskey and McCain (1974). The physical attraction items from that scale were not used, as no clues regarding the speaker's physical attractiveness were present in the study.

The Manipulation:

A series of scripts was prepared for presentation to the subjects. Each script was of similar content (except for setting); the only difference being use by one of the actors of the "powerful" or the "powerless" speech style in response to the other actor in the script. Scripts consisted of ten lines each. This parallels the form appearing in the Erickson, et al. (1978) study. The rationale for use of the ten lines was: first, that the script should be kept relatively short for ease of presentation; and second, that the script be long enough to provide a strong enough experimental manipulation to provide results.

The scripts were transcribed, rather than recorded and played back to the subjects, for this reason: in the Erickson, et al. (1978) study, mode of presentation (written or oral) was tested. From their results, Erickson and his associates concluded the following:

There was no evidence that style effects on the person perception measures were restricted to the oral-

presentation conditions. This finding indicates that the style features in the written mode were sufficient to produce differences in perceptions of the witness and that the style features unique to the oral mode did not have any effects over and above those produced by features present in both modes (p. 277).

Subjects:

Subjects (N=207) were students enrolled in introductory level speech communication courses at a major university in the Spring of 1982. The original sample included 118 females and 89 males. About half of the tests were given in an in-class setting as extra credit for the students involved. The balance of subjects participated in evening experimental sessions for extra credit for their classes.

Procedure:

The test booklet consisted of three parts:

(1) a short demographic questionnaire designed to obtain information regarding the sex of the subject;

(2) a transcribed conversation (as described earlier) followed by a questionnaire designed to discern subjects' responses to powerful and powerless speakers; and,

(3) Bem's Sex-Role Inventory (1974).

The Sex-Role Inventory was presented last to prevent sensitizing subjects to the issue of gender.

After subjects were seated, the test booklets were distributed

and brief instructions regarding the booklet were given. Students were asked to complete one section at a time as a group: i.e., all students finished Part I before the group moved on to Part II, and so on. The session was handled this way to prevent those who reached Part III first from influencing those who were not yet finished rating the speakers in their scripts (i.e., Part II).

After completing the booklet, subjects were debriefed and asked to sign consent forms. These were handed in as the students signed their names for extra credit for their classes. Only one subject refused permission to use his data for the analysis segment of the experiment.

Results

Part I:

The first step in the data analysis was a determination of subjects' sex-type. The procedure outlined by Bem (1981c) was used. Feminine and Masculine scale medians were computed first. The Feminine scale median was 5.00, and the Masculine scale median 5.20. This compares to Bem's figures of 4.90 and 4.95, respectively. The decision was made to utilize the sample medians of this study, rather than Bem's, as it was felt that the sample was large enough and representative enough (in terms of subject sex) to warrant doing so. This corresponds to Bem's instructions regarding this issue (1981c).

Subjects' sex-types were then computed. Fourteen subjects were rejected as cross-sex-typed, leaving 193 in the sample: 110 female (57%) and 83 male (43%). As was mentioned earlier, Bem's Gender Schema Theory (1981a) does not make any predictions regarding

cross-sex-typed individuals. The final sample included 102 (52.8%) sex-typed and 91 (47.2%) non-sex-typed individuals. Of the 102 sex-typed subjects, 55 (53.9%) were female and 47 (46.1%) were male. Of the 91 non-sex-typed subjects, 55 (60.4%) were female and 36 (39.6%) were male.

Factor Analysis:

The next step in the analysis was a determination of the factors underlying subjects' responses.[6] A principal components factor analysis (minimum eigenvalue = 1.5) was run on the data. To be considered loaded on a certain factor, an item had to have a factor loading of at least .50 on only one factor and no more than .30 on any other factor. Also, in order for a factor to be considered for further analysis, it had to have at least two items loaded on it.

In order to determine the stability of the factors that were identified in this manner, a second factor analysis was done using only the items that had met the preliminary criterion. The same procedure was followed in the second factor analysis as was noted above for the first factor analysis. In this case, however, in order to be considered loaded on a factor, an item had to have a factor loading of at least .60 on only one factor and no more than .30 on any other factor. Again, a factor had to be defined by at least two items in order to be considered meaningful.

After the second factor analysis, four factors emerged for further discussion. The first factor, accounting for 55.8% of the variance in the first thirty-two items, consisted of four items: powerful--powerless, active--passive, ambitious--not ambitious, and aggressive--meek. This factor was labeled "dominance".

The second factor to emerge accounted for 27.4% of the variance in the first thirty-two items. It consisted of the following four items: intelligent--not intelligent, competent--incompetent, organized--disorganized, and knowledgeable--not knowledgeable. This factor was labeled "competence".[7] Together, these two factors accounted for 83.2% of the variance in the first thirty-two items.

On the ten McCroskey/McCain attraction items, two factors emerged. The first, labeled "personal attraction", accounted for 56.4% of the variance in the attraction items. This factor was composed of the following three items:

(1) "It would be difficult to meet and talk with him/her;"

(2) "He/She wouldn't fit into my circle of friends;" and,

(3) "We could never establish a personal friendship with each other."

The second factor to emerge from the ten attraction items was labeled "task attraction". This factor accounted for the balance of the variance in the attraction items.[8] "Task attraction" was composed of three items:

(1) "I have confidence in his/her ability to get the job done;"

(2) "If I wanted to get things done, I could probably depend on him/her;" and,

(3) "He/She wouldn't be a poor problem solver."

The results of the second factor analysis are presented in Table I.

Reliability:

Coefficient alpha was computed for the four factors identified in the factor analysis. Alpha figures for the four factors were within the acceptable range for reliability estimates: dominance

TABLE L. Rotated Factor Loadings.

ITEM	FACTOR DOMINANCE	COMPETENCE
Powerful-Powerless	.74	-.01
Active-Passive	.73	-.12
Ambitious-Not Ambitious	.72	-.19
Aggressive-Meek	.68	-.09
Intelligent-Not Intelligent	-.32	.69
Competent-Incompetent	-.12	.67
Organized-Disorganized	-.12	.65
Knowledgeable-Not Knowledgeable	-.11	.63
Eigenvalue Subtotals	4.46	2.19
Variance Subtotals	55.80	27.40
Total Eigenvalue	6.65	
Total Variance	83.20	

ITEM	FACTOR PERSONAL ATTRACTION	TASK ATTRACTION
It would be difficult to meet and talk with him/her.	.72	.07
He/She wouldn't fit into my circle of friends.	.68	-.06
We could never establish a personal friendship with each other.	.74	-.13
I have confidence in his/her ability to get the job done.	-.09	.74
If I wanted to get things done, I could probably depend on him/her.	-.04	.86
He/She wouldn't be a poor problem solver.	-.01	.64
Eigenvalue Subtotals	2.02	1.57
Variance Subtotals	56.40	43.60
Total Eigenvalue	3.59	
Total Variance	100.00 (approximately)	

(a=.81), competence (a=.81), personal attraction (a=.73), and task attraction (a=.79).

Analyses of Variance:

Initially, it was necessary to determine if sex-typed individuals were sensitive to the issue of power in speech style as being gender related. A multivariate analysis of variance was carried out using speaker style and subject sex-type as independent variables and the feminine/masculine scale item as the dependent variable. The anticipated interaction between subject sex-type and speaker style was significant ($F=3.86$, $p=.05$). The Studentized Range Statistic (or SRS) indicated a significant ($p<.025$) difference between powerful and powerless speech on the gender scale only for sex-typed individuals. This indicated that while sex-typed subjects associated powerful speech with masculinity, and powerless speech with femininity, non-sex-typed individuals did not. The results of this analysis are presented in Table II.

In the next step of the analysis, all four of the independent variables (setting, sex-type of subject, speaker sex and speech style of speaker) were put into a multivariate analysis of variance with all four of the dependent variables that were derived from the factor analysis (competence, dominance, personal attraction, task attraction). Wilks' Lambda for four main effects and eleven interactions were computed.

The first four hypotheses involved the issue of differences between sex-typed and non-sex-typed individuals in their perceptions of powerful and powerless speakers. The data revealed that there were no main effects for subjects' sex-type on any of the four dependent measures. Furthermore, none of the anticipated

TABLE II. Cell Means Demonstrating Interaction Effect for Feminine/Masculine Scale, Focusing on Speech Style and Subject Sex-type.

	Sex-typed Subjects	Non-sex-typed Subjects
Powerful Speech Style	5.46 (N=48)	5.36 (N=50)
	↕ (SRS=4.2, $p < .025$)	
Powerless Speech Style	4.41 (N=54)	5.29 (N=41)

*Studentized Range Statistic (.025 level) = 3.98

interactions involving subject sex-type, speaker sex, and/or speaker speech style even approached significance. In light of this, it can be seen that no support for any of the hypotheses regarding differences between sex-typed and non-sex-typed individuals in their perceptions of powerful and powerless speakers can be found in the data.

The hypothesis regarding perceptions of powerful and powerless speakers predicted that powerful speakers would be viewed more positively on all measures than powerless speakers. Although the multivariate analysis of variance revealed significant differences between powerful and powerless speakers (Lambda = .848, $p < .001$), subsequent univariate analyses of variance revealed that this effect applied only to two of the dependent measures: competence ($F=6.74$, $p=.01$), and dominance ($F=24.26$, $p < .001$). These cell means are presented in Table III.

The data indicate that powerful speakers are seen as significantly more dominant than powerless speakers. The difference in competence between powerful and powerless speakers was significant, but in the direction opposite of that predicted. Powerful speakers were seen as significantly less competent than powerless speakers.

The only other significant effect was seen in conversation setting (Lambda=.810, p .001). Univariate analyses indicated that the setting effect applied to two of the dependent variables: competence ($F=9.72$, p .001), and task attraction ($F=10.70$, p .001). These cell means are reported in Table IV.

The evidence indicates that subjects perceived speakers in the office setting as least competent and speakers in the social

TABLE III. Cell Means Demonstrating Effects for Competence and Dominance, Focusing on Speaker Style.

COMPETENCE: $F=6.74$, $p=.01$

Powerful Speakers	3.35 (N=90)
Powerless Speakers	3.69 (N=90)

DOMINANCE: $F=24.26$, $p<.001$

Powerful Speakers	5.73 (N=90)
Powerless Speakers	4.74 (N=90)

TABLE IV. Cell Means Demonstrating Effects for Competence and Task Attraction, Focusing on Conversation Setting.

COMPETENCE: $F=9.72$, $p<.001$

Courtroom	3.53 (N=60)
Social	3.85 (N=59)
Office	3.18 (N=61)

TASK ATTRACTION: $F=10.70$, $p<.001$

Courtroom	3.45 (N=60)
Social	3.73 (N=59)
Office	2.97 (N=61)

setting most competent. In addition, speakers in the office setting were seen as least attractive as task partners with speakers in the social setting seen as most attractive as task partners. These results were not anticipated and indicate that subjects' responses to speakers varied across settings.

As was noted earlier, none of the other main effects or interactions were indicated as being significant by the multivariate analysis of variance procedure.

Part II:

The failure to discover effects for subject sex-type was puzzling in light of the amount of evidence that systematic differences do exist between sex-typed and non-sex-typed individuals (Bem, 1981a). It was thought that by focusing on only those subjects at the extreme ends of Bem's sex-typing procedure, perhaps the predicted relationships would emerge. Pursuant to this, the second part of the data analysis focused only on the most and least sex-typed subjects in the original subject pool. These subjects were identified using the $\pm$-score conversion method discussed by Bem (1981c). There were fifty-one sex-typed (twenty-five Masculine, twenty-six Feminine) and forty-five non-sex-typed (twenty-three "androgynous", twenty-two "undifferentiated") subjects in this group.

Reliability:

The same factors (dominance, competence, personal attraction, task attraction) were used for the secondary data analysis as had been used in the primary data analysis. Alpha figures for three of the scales were within the acceptable range: dominance ($\underline{a}$=.80), competence ($\underline{a}$=.79), and task attraction ($\underline{a}$=.81). The personal attraction scale was a little low ($\underline{a}$=.70) compared to the other scales.

Analyses of Variance:

First, a manipulation check was performed to determine whether sex-typed individuals would label "powerful" speech as masculine and "powerless" speech as feminine; i.e., that power in speech was seen as gender related by sex-typed individuals. A multivariate analysis of variance using speaker style and subject sex-type as independent variables and the feminine/masculine scale item as the dependent variable revealed that sex-typed individuals did label powerful speech "masculine" and powerless speech "feminine". This was not the case with the non-sex-typed subjects, who made no such distinction (F=2.93, p=.09). The Studentized Range Statistic (or SRS) was significant at the .10 level. These results are presented in Table V.

Preliminary analyses revealed that speaker sex had no effect on subjects' ratings of the speakers on the four dependent measures. For this reason, data was collapsed over this variable. Next, a multivariate analysis of variance was conducted that included subject sex-type, speaker style and setting as independent variables and the four factors (competence, dominance, personal attraction, task attraction) as dependent measures.

Results indicated that only speaker style and setting had any effect on subjects' ratings of speakers. Subject sex-type did not emerge as a relevant factor in this process (Lambda=.946, p=.365). As in the larger sample, no support for any of the hypotheses regarding differences between sex-typed and non-sex-typed individuals in their perceptions of powerful and powerless speakers can be found in the data.

TABLE V. Cell Means Demonstrating Interaction Effect for Feminine/Masculine Scale, Focusing on Speech Style and Subject Sex-type.

	Sex-typed Subjects	Non-sex-typed Subjects
Powerful Speech Style	5.32 (N=22)	5.17 (N=24)
	↕ (SRS=3.59, $p < .10$)	
Powerless Speech Style	4.07 (N=29)	5.14 (N=21)

*Studentized Range Statistic (.10 level)=3.29.

Although the multivariate analysis of variance indicated significant differences between reactions to powerful and powerless speakers (Lambda=.834, p=.007), subsequent univariate analyses revealed that this effect applied to only two of the dependent measures: competence (F=6.80, p=.01), and dominance (F=11.45, p=.001). These results mirror the results obtained from the original sample. As in the original sample, the data indicate that powerful speakers are seen as significantly more dominant, and significantly less competent, than powerless speakers. The cell means are presented in Table VI.

The only other significant main effect was for conversation setting (Lambda=.728, p=.002). Univariate analyses revealed that this effect applied to two of the dependent variables: competence (F=3.55, p=.033), and task attraction (F=7.47, p=.001). As in the original sample, speakers in the social setting were seen as most competent and attractive as task partners. These results are presented in Table VII.

No other main effects or interactions were indicated as being significant by the multivariate analysis of variance procedure.

TABLE VI. Cell Means Demonstrating Effects for Competence and Dominance, Focusing on Speaker Style.

Competence (F=6.80; p=.01):

Powerful speakers	3.35 (N=43)
Powerless speakers	3.79 (N=48)

Dominance (F=11.45; p=.001)

Powerful speakers	5.79 (N=43)
Powerless speakers	4.85 (N=48)

TABLE VII. Cell Means Demonstrating Effects for Competence and Task Attraction, Focusing on Conversational Setting

Competence (F=3.55; p=.033)

Office	3.46 (N=30)
Social	3.91 (N=32)
Courtroom	3.35 (N=29)

Task Attraction (F=7.47; p=.001)

Office	2.99 (N=30)
Social	3.90 (N=32)
Courtroom	3.38 (N=29)

DISCUSSION

No significant differences between the overall response patterns of sex-typed and non-sex-typed individuals emerged from either the primary data analysis using the original subject pool ($p=.35$), or the secondary data analysis using the restricted subsample of subjects ($p=.36$). Sex-typed subjects associated powerful speech with masculinity and powerless speech with femininity in both analyses, while non-sex-typed subjects did not. This is evidence that sex-typed subjects were sensitive to a relationship between power in speech and gender. However, none of the anticipated interactions between subject sex-type, speaker sex and speech style were significant. No evidence was found to support the discrimination hypothesis as it was developed in this study.

Implications for Bem's Gender Schema Theory (1981a) are twofold. First, sex-typed subjects showed a readiness to process information in terms of gender in that they associated powerful speech with masculinity and powerless speech with femininity. In this sense, the data provide support for Gender Schema Theory. On the other hand, subjects' sex-typed did not emerge as a significant factor in subjects' overall response to the speakers. This result fails to support Gender Schema Theory in that subjects' sex-type did not seem to have a significant effect on attributions made about others.

These data provide mixed support for Bem's Gender Schema Theory as it relates to the perception of others. Perhaps this theory is best suited to perceptions of the self rather than to perceptions of others. This study did not touch on the self-perception aspect of Gender Schema Theory, and therefore, no

conclusions may be drawn regarding this aspect of the theory. That element of Gender Schema Theory related to individuals' perceptions of others found little support in this study.

The second proposition developed in this research was the deficit hypothesis. This predicted that powerless speakers would be perceived less positively overall than powerful speakers. Results indicated that there was a trade-off in that while powerful speakers were seen as more dominant, they were also seen as less competent than powerless speakers. This effect held true for both the original and restricted samples. Power in speech style was a significant determinant of subjects' response patterns for two of the four dependent variables: competence and dominance. The results for the dominance factor were in the anticipated direction: i.e., powerful speakers were seen as more dominant than their powerless counterparts. From this result, it appears that powerful speakers did appear to be more aggressive, ambitious and active than did powerless speakers. The absence of significant interactions involving speech style and conversational setting indicates that this effect was not limited to any of the three settings used in the design.

The same strength of effect was noted concerning power and speaker competence ratings. On the surface, the result that powerful speakers were seen as less competent than powerless speakers may seem surprising. However, a closer look at "powerful" speech may suggest an explanation for this result. "Powerless" speech was characterized by several speech elements said to lead to listener' perception of speaker powerlessness: e.g., qualifiers, compound requests, tag questions, and disclaimers. It is conceivable that the use of some or all of these speech elements may lead listeners

to make a wholly different decision regarding the "powerless" speaker. For instance, perhaps the use of phrases such as "I may be mistaken, but I think...." make a speaker appear more cautious or learned than one who states his or her opinions dogmatically, leaving no room for other options.

To investigate this possibility, analyses of variance were done on the larger original sample, using speech style as the independent variable. A number of scales from the first thirty-two items that could conceivably be associated with degree of education, intellectual caution, or openness to discussion were entered as dependent variables. Only three scales from this group emerged as being significantly influenced by speech style: Lacks professional manner--Has professional manner (F=9.73, p=.002), Subjective--Objective (F=5.91, p=.016), and Inarticulate--Articulate (F=5.41, p=.021). Subsequent comparisons of means indicated that the powerful speakers were seen as having a more professional manner, as being more objective, and as being more articulate than powerless speakers. These means are presented in Table VIII. So, it does not appear from these analyses that powerless speakers seemed more intellectually cautious or better educated than powerful speakers. It should be noted that there were no scales in the questionnaire that directly tapped subjects' impressions of how well speakers "thought out" their statements before making them (i.e., how cautious they were), or how well educated they seemed. Either or both of these qualities may be connected with powerless speech, or perceptions or speaker competence, or both. It appears that mixed support was found for the deficit hypothesis. Powerful speech did lead to perceptions of speaker dominance, but it also decreased perceptions of speaker competence.

TABLE VIII. Cell Means Demonstrating Effects for Three Dependent Variables, Focusing on Speech Style.

Inarticulate--Articulate: $F=5.41$, $p=.021$

Powerful	5.73 (N=95)
Powerless	5.15 (N=94)

Subjective--Objective: $F=5.91$, $p=.016$

Powerful	5.02 (N=95)
Powerless	4.65 (N=95)

Lacks professional manner--Has professional manner: $F=9.73$, $p=.002$

Powerful	5.77 (N=98)
Powerless	4.65 (N=95)

One purpose of this investigation was to clarify the issue of power as it related to women. It was thought that by sharpening the focus onto the source of the problem, the cause of women's apparent powerlessness could be identified. It seemed that the cause was either the source (women who behave in a powerless way) or the receiver (people who discriminate against women). An assumption of this argument was that power is a positive quality. Apparently, this assumption is incorrect in that the results of this study reveal that there is some kind of trade-off involved with the use of power. Although a powerful style does have a positive outcome in that it leads to perceptions of dominance, objectiveness, and professionalism; it may also lead to perceptions of incompetence. These findings indicate that power is a more complex issue than was originally anticipated.

The main effect for setting was not anticipated. Speakers in the social setting were seen as most competent and most attractive as task partners in both the primary analysis with the original sample and the secondary analysis with the restricted sample. These results indicate that subjects responded differently to speakers in the three settings. Although this finding may be worthy of further investigation in future research, the lack of interaction between setting and speaker style (the only other significant factor in subjects' response to speakers) shows that this differential reaction across settings did not interfere with subjects' perceptions of the element of power in speech.

What do these results suggest about the role of powerful speech in the feminist quest for influence in modern society? Although the use of powerful behavior elicits a number of positive responses,

there is also a trade-off involved in that some negative responses occur as well (i.e., perceptions of incompetence). Perhaps powerful behavior is appropriate in some contexts, but not in others. Kanter (1977) and Levinson (1980) suggest that assertive, powerful styles are typical of leaders in organizations. For someone in a leadership role, then, dominant behavior may be appropriate. The opposite may be true for peers involved in a group assignment, where cooperation is the key to success. The nature of power remains a puzzle--with a number of missing pieces.

Some of the missing pieces might be provided if the notion of "power" was reoperationalized. To date, many definitions of power have been stated in terms of what is not powerless (see Erickson, et al., 1978 for one example). If emphasis was redirected at what power is, rather than what it is not, then perhaps the "ghost" of power would materialize for researchers of this issue.

Of course, in the best of all possible worlds, power would be irrelevant. Men and women alike would be free to develop to their fullest potential without concern for the manipulations of the "powerful".

NOTES

1. "Less positive perception" is defined relative to subjects' reactions to users of the "powerful" speech style. That is, it was expected that "powerless" speakers will be perceived to be closer to the negative endpoints of the scales discussed than will be "powerful" speakers. This determination of subject reaction has been the method of choice in other studies of this nature (Bradley, 1981; Erickson, et al., 1978; Newcombe and Arnkoff, 1979).

2. The Bem Sex-Role Inventory (1974) consists of two scales: a Masculinity scale and a Femininity scale. Each scale contains twenty items judged to be socially desirable for that sex-type. When filling out the inventory, each subject is asked to indicate on a seven-point scale how well each of these items describes himself or herself. From these responses, an individual may be identified as sex-typed: i.e., scoring highly on either of the scales, but not both; or non-sex-typed: i.e., scoring either highly on both scales ("androgynous"), low on both scales ("undifferentiated"), or highly on the scale opposite to the biological sex of the subject ("cross-sex-typed"). It is Bem's contention that the attitudes and behaviors of sex-typed individuals are strongly influenced by gender orientation, while those of non-sex-typed individuals are not.

3. Although some researchers have noted the fallacy in viewing androgynous and undifferentiated individuals together in a

theoretical sense (Spence and Helmreich, 1981), it is acceptable to group them together within the bounds of this investigation because the purpose of the study is to examine the systematic differences between those who have a traditional sex-role orientation (in terms of attitudes and behaviors), and those who do not. Bem's comments in Bem, Martyna and Watson (1976) and Bem's (1981b) response to Spence and Helmreich support this approach in that androgynous and undifferentiated individuals differ systematically from sex-typed individuals in that "...neither the androgynous nor the undifferentiated individual partitions his or her self-concept into the two categories of masculine and feminine" (Bem, 1976: p.1023); whereas sex-typed individuals do. Since this partitioning process is manifested in differential attitudes and behaviors on the parts of sex-typed versus non-sex-typed (androgynous and undifferentiated) individuals, it seems logical to group androgynous and undifferentiated individuals together for the purposes of this investigation.

4. Hewitt and Stokes (1975) describe five different forms of disclaimers: hedges, credentialing, sin licenses, cognitive disclaimers, and appeals for suspension of judgement. The form used in this investigation is the "hedge". Use of this form is appropriate here as it implies a lack of confidence in the self and minimal committment to one's positions.

5. Definitions of "powerful" and "powerless" speech style used by Erickson, et al. (1978) are similar, but not identical, to

those provided for use in this study. A number of non-linguistic variables (e.g., dysfluencies) were included in their analysis that have not been included here.

6. The ten McCroskey/McCain items were factored separately as the form of these items differed from the thirty-two semantic differential items.

7. Surprisingly, the "trustworthiness" item did not load on the "competence" factor. Trustworthiness has consistently appeared as an element of speaker competence (Whitehead, 1968).

8. Of note here is the fact that four of the McCroskey/McCain attraction items did not load on the attraction factors as they had predicted.

REFERENCES

Bem, S.L. The measurement of psychological androgyny. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1974, 42, 155-162.

Bem, S.L. Sex role adaptability: One consequence of psychological androgyny. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1975, 31, 634-643.

Bem, S.L. Gender Schema Theory: A cognitive account of sex-typing. Psychological Review, 1981(a), 88, 354-364.

Bem, S.I. The BSRI and Gender Schema Theory: A reply to Spence and Helmreich. Psychological Review, 1981(b), 88, 369-371.

Bem, S.L. Bem Sex-Role Inventory: Professional Manual. Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press, 1981. (c)

Bem, S.L., Martyna, W. and C. Watson. Sex-typing and androgyny: Further explorations of the expressive domain. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1976, 34, 1016-1023.

Bradley, P.H. The folk-linguistics of women's speech: An empirical examination. Communication Monographs, 1981, 48, 73-90.

Broverman, I.K., Broverman, D.M., Clarkson, F.E., Rosenkrantz, P.S., and S.R. Vogel. Sex-role stereotypes and clinical judgements of mental health. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1970, 34, 1-7.

Callary, R.E. Status perception through syntax. Language and Speech, 1974, 17, 187-192.

Deaux, K. and B. Major. Sex-related patterns in the unit of perception. Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 1977, 3, 297-300.

Erickson, B., Lind, E.A., Johnson, B.C., and W.M. O'Barr. Speech style and impression formation in court setting: The effects of "powerful" and "powerless" speech. Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 1978, 14, 266-279.

Goldberg, P. Are women prejudiced against women? Transactions, 1968, 5, 28-30.

Haas, A. Male and female spoken language differences: Stereotypes and evidence. Psychological Bulletin, 1979, 86, 616-626.

Hennig, M. and A. Jardim. The Managerial Woman. Garden City, New York: Anchor Press, 1977.

Hewitt, J.P. and R. Stokes. Disclaimers. American Sociological Review, 1975, 40, 1-11.

Hopper, R. Language attitudes in the employment interview. Communication Monographs, 1977, 44, 346-351.

Hopper, R. Power is as power speaks: Linguistic sex differences reconsidered. From Proceedings of the 2nd and 3rd Conferences on Communication, Language, and Gender. L.E. Larmer, M.K. Badami (Eds.). University of Wisconsin-Extension, 1982: p. 162-170.

Kail, R.V. and L. Levine. Encoding processes and sex-role preferences. Journal of Experimental Child Psychology, 1976, 21, 256-263.

Kanter, R.M. Men and Women of the Corporation. New York: Basic Books, 1977.

Key, M.R. Male/Female Language. Metuchen, New Jersey: Scarecrow Press, 1975.

Koblinsky, S.G., Cruse, D.F. and A.I. Sugawara. Sex-role stereotypes and children's memory for story content. Child Development, 1978, 49, 452-458.

Kohlberg, L. A cognitive-development analysis of children's sex-role concepts and attitudes. In The Development of Sex Differences. E.E. Maccoby (Ed.). Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1966: p.82-173.

Lakoff, R. Language and Women's Place. New York: Harper Colophon Books, 1975.

Levinson, H. Criteria for choosing Chief Executives. Harvard Business Review, 1980, July-August, 113-120.

Liben, L.S. and M.L. Signorella. Gander-related schemata and constructive memory in children. Child Development, 1980, 51, 11-18.

Lippa, R. Androgyny, sex-typing and the perception of masculinity/femininity in handwriting. Journal of Research in Personality, 1977, 11, 21-37.

McCroskey, J.C. and T.A. McCain. The measurement of interpersonal attraction. Speech Monographs, 1974, 41, 261-266.

McKee, J.P. and A.C. Sherriffs. The differential evaluation of males and females. Journal of Personality, 1957, 25, 256-261.

Markus, H., Crane, M., Bernstein, S., and M. Siladi. Self-schemas and gender. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1982, 42, 38-50.

Mischel, H.N. Sex bias in the evaluation of professional achievements. Journal of Educational Psychology, 1974, 66, 157-166.

Newcombe, N. and D.B. Arnkoff. Effects of speech style and sex of speaker on person perception. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1979, 36, 1293-1303.

1970 Census of Population. Characteristics of the population: U.S. summary. U.S. Department of Commerce: June, 1973.

Spence, J.T. and R.L. Helmreich. Androgyny versus gender schema: A comment on Bem's Gender Schema Theory. Psychological Review, 1981, 88, 365-368.

Trudgill, P. Sex, covert prestige, and linguistic change in the Urban British English of Norwich. Language in Society, 1972, 1, 179-195.

Tunnell, G. Sex role and cognitive schemata: Person perception in feminine and androgynous women. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1981, 40, 1126-1136.

Whitehead, J. Factors of source credibility. Quarterly Journal of Speech, 1968, 54, 59-63.